UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/582,787	10/582,787 06/13/2006 Masato Kaneda		Q79148	5976	
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 12/30/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER			
	LVÁNIA AVENUE, N	EOFF, ANCA			
WASHINGTON	N, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1795		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/30/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/582,787	KANEDA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	ANCA EOFF	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 December 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the content of the properties of the properties of the content of the properties of the prop	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplication (inclination)	102 021).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>3,6,12,14,16 and 18</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Cynthia H Kelly/	/Anca Eoff/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795	Examiner, Art Unit 1795		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On pages 2-3 of the Remarks, the applicant argues the rejection over Koyanagi et al. (WO 03/072634) in view of Wyatt et al. (US Pg-Pub 2003/0118946). The applicant argues that Koyanagi et al. teach tetramethyl benzene in a developer and Wyatt et al. teach diisopropylbenzene in a developer but do not teach that tetramethylbenzene and diisopropylbenzene have the same properties. The applicant further argues that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use tetramethylbenzene in an amount of 20% by mass in a developer, based on the teaching that diisopropylbenzene in present in an amount of 20% by mass in a developer.

The examiner would like to show that Koyanagi et al. teach the use of tetramethylbenzene in a developer for photosensitive composition and tetramethylbenzene is an aromatic hydrocarbon. Wyatt et al. teach a developer for photosensitive printing plates, wherein said developer may comprise 20% by mass of an aromatic hydrocarbon (see Example 4 in table 1, par.0062). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use an aromatic hydrocarbon in an amount of 20% by mass in a developer.

The rejection of claims 3.13.16 and 17 under 35 USC 103(a) over Koyanagi et al. (WO 03/072634) in view of Wyatt et al. (US Pg-Pub 2003/0118946) is maintained.

.